arXiv:1512.03401v2 [math.OC] 23 Mar 2016

Lieb's concavity theorem, matrix geometric means, and semidefinite optimization

Hamza Fawzi* James Saunderson†

March 23, 2016

Abstract

A famous result of Lieb establishes that the map $(A, B) \mapsto \operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right]$ is jointly concave in the pair (A, B) of positive definite matrices, where K is a fixed matrix and $t \in [0, 1]$. In this paper we show that Lieb's function admits an explicit semidefinite programming formulation for any rational $t \in [0, 1]$. Our construction makes use of a semidefinite formulation of weighted matrix geometric means. We provide an implementation of our constructions in Matlab.

Keywords: Matrix convexity; Semidefinite optimization; Linear matrix inequalities; Lieb's concavity theorem; Matrix geometric means

AMS Subject Classification: 90C22; 47A63; 81P45

1 Introduction

In 1973 Lieb [Lie73] proved the following fundamental theorem.

Theorem 1 (Lieb)**.** *Let K be a fixed matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$. Then for any $t \in [0, 1]$, the map*

$$(A, B) \mapsto \operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right] \tag{1}$$

is jointly concave in (A, B) where A and B are respectively $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ Hermitian positive definite matrices.

This theorem plays a fundamental role in quantum information theory and was used for example to establish convexity of the quantum relative entropy as well as strong subadditivity [LR73]. In this paper we give an explicit representation of Lieb's function using semidefinite programming when t is a rational number. More precisely we prove:

Theorem 2. *Let K be a fixed matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ and let $t = p/q$ be any rational number in $[0, 1]$. Then the convex set*

$$\left\{(A, B, \tau) : \operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right] \geq \tau\right\}$$

has a semidefinite programming representation with at most $2\lfloor \log_2 q \rfloor + 3$ linear matrix inequalities of size at most $2nm \times 2nm$.

*Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139. Email: hfawzi@mit.edu

†Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195. Email: jamesfs@uw.edu

Semidefinite programming is a class of convex optimization problems that can be solved in polynomial-time and that is supported by many existing numerical software packages. Having a semidefinite programming formulation of a function allows us to combine it with a wide family of other semidefinite representable functions and constraints, and solve the resulting problem to global optimality. In fact we have implemented our constructions in the Matlab-based modeling language CVX [GB14] and we are making them available online on the webpage

http://www.mit.edu/~hfawzi/lieb_cvx.html.

Matrix geometric means Our proof of Theorem 2 relies crucially on the notion of *matrix geometric mean*. Given $t \in [0,1]$ and positive definite matrices A and B, the *t-weighted matrix geometric mean* of A and B denoted interchangeably by $G_t(A,B)$ or $A\#_t B$ is defined as:

$$G_t(A,B) = A\#_t B := A^{1/2}\left(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}\right)^t A^{1/2}. \tag{2}$$

Note that when A and B are scalars (or commuting matrices) this formula reduces to the simpler expression $A^{1-t}B^t$. Equation (2) constitutes a generalization of the geometric mean to noncommuting matrices and satisfies many of the properties that are expected from a mean operation [KA80, Bha09]. One remarkable property of the matrix geometric mean is that it is *matrix concave*: if $t \in [0,1]$, then for any pair $X = (A_1, B_1)$ and $Y = (A_2, B_2)$ we have:

$$G_t\left(\frac{X+Y}{2}\right) \succeq \frac{1}{2}(G_t(X) + G_t(Y))$$

where $\succeq$ indicates the Löwner partial order on Hermitian matrices (i.e., $A \succeq B \Leftrightarrow A - B$ positive semidefinite). This remarkable fact can be used to give a simple proof of Lieb's concavity theorem, see e.g., [NEG13]. The matrix geometric mean was recently shown in [Sag13] to have a semidefinite programming formulation. More precisely Sagnol showed that for any rational $t = p/q \in [0,1]$ the convex set

$$\text{hyp}_t := \left\{(A,B,T) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n : G_t(A,B) \succeq T\right\} \tag{3}$$

has a semidefinite programming representation with at most $O(\log_2(q))$ linear matrix inequalities of size $2n \times 2n$. In this paper we show how an SDP representation of the matrix geometric mean can be used to get an SDP representation of Lieb's function as well as numerous other convex/concave functions. Table 1 summarizes the functions we consider in this paper, together with the size of the representations.

We only became aware of the result by Sagnol [Sag13] after the first preprint of this paper appeared. As such our alternative, and arguably simpler, SDP construction of the matrix geometric mean is included in Appendix A of this paper. Our construction has the same size (Theorem 3) as Sagnol's, and extends to the regime $t \in [-1,0] \cup [1,2]$ for which G_t is matrix convex. Furthermore, our code, which is available online, is based on the construction in Appendix A.

Implications for quantum relative entropy and related functions Our results can be used to solve, approximately, *quantum relative entropy programs* [CS15] using semidefinite programming. The quantum relative entropy function is defined as:

$$S(A\|B) = \text{tr}\left[A(\log A - \log B)\right]$$

Function	Properties	Size of SDP description ($t = p/q$)
Matrix geometric mean $(A, B) \mapsto A\#_t B$	matrix concave for $t \in [0, 1]$ matrix convex for $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$	$O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size $2n$ (Theorem 3) See also [Sag13].
Lieb-Ando function $(A, B) \mapsto \mathrm{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right]$ ($K \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ fixed)	concave for $t \in [0, 1]$ convex for $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$	$O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size $2nm$ (Theorem 4)
$A \mapsto \mathrm{tr}\left[(K^* A^t K)^{1/t}\right]$ ($K \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ fixed)	concave for $t \in [-1, 1] \setminus \{0\}$ convex for $t \in [1, 2]$	$O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size $2nm$ (Theorem 6)
Tsallis entropy $A \mapsto \frac{1}{t}\mathrm{tr}\left[A^{1-t} - A\right]$	concave for $t \in [0, 1]$ converges to von Neumann entropy $S(A)$ when $t \to 0$	$O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size $2n$ (Remark 2)
Tsallis relative entropy $(A, B) \mapsto \frac{1}{t}\mathrm{tr}\left[A - A^{1-t} B^t\right]$	convex for $t \in [0, 1]$ converges to relative entropy $S(A\|B)$ when $t \to 0$	$O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size $2nm$ (Remark 2)

Table 1: List of functions with SDP formulations considered in this paper.

where A and B are positive definite matrices. It is a simple corollary of Lieb's theorem that S is jointly convex in (A, B). Indeed this follows from observing that:

$$S(A\|B) = \lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{1}{t}\mathrm{tr}\left[A - A^{1-t}B^t\right] \tag{4}$$

where we used the fact that for any matrix $X \succ 0$:

$$\log X = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{t}(X^t - I).$$

Identity (4) together with the semidefinite programming representation of Lieb's function can be used to get SDP approximations of the relative entropy function $S(A\|B)$ to arbitrary accuracy, by choosing t small enough. Unfortunately however, the convergence of $S_t(A\|B) := \frac{1}{t}\mathrm{tr}\left[A - A^{1-t}B^t\right]$ to $S(A\|B)$ is slow (it is in $O(t)$) and obtaining decent approximations of $S(A\|B)$ thus requires to use very small values of t. While the size of the SDP descriptions of $S_t(A\|B)$ grows only like $\log(1/t)$, we observed that standard numerical algorithms to solve these SDPs become numerically ill-conditioned as t gets close to 0. There exist however other methods to obtain approximations of $S(A\|B)$ that converge much faster and are better behaved numerically and we discuss such methods in future work [FSP15].

Related works It is well-known that the scalar functions $(x, y) \mapsto x^{1-t}y^t$ admit second-order cone representations when t is a rational number [BTN01, Chapter 3]. The SDP representation of the matrix geometric mean can be seen as a matrix generalization of such results. The authors of [HNS15] give a free semidefinite representations of the matrix power functions $X \mapsto X^t$ for rational

$t \in [-1, 2]$, however it seems that they were not aware of the paper by Sagnol [Sag13] since such a representation already appears in this work. Furthermore the construction in [Sag13] is in some cases smaller than [HNS15]: for general rational $t = p/q \in [0, 1]$ the construction in [Sag13] has size $O(\log_2(q))$ whereas in some cases the construction in [HNS15] may require $\Omega(q)$ LMIs. The authors of [HNS15] also mentioned that certain multivariate versions of the matrix power function fail to have semidefinite representations. Working in the setting of geometric means, and then tensor products, seems to give one natural extension to the multivariate case (see Remark 1).

Outline In Section 2 we set up the basic notations and terminology for the paper and in Section 3 we prove the main results of the paper giving SDP representations of the functions given in Table 1.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce basic notation and terminology used throughout the paper. Let $\mathbf{H}^n$ be the space of $n \times n$ Hermitian matrices, $\mathbf{H}^n_+ \subset \mathbf{H}^n$ the cone of $n \times n$ Hermitian positive semidefinite matrices and $\mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ the cone of $n \times n$ strictly positive definite matrices. We use the notation $X \succeq Y$ if $X - Y$ is positive semidefinite, and $X \succ Y$ if $X - Y$ is positive definite. Suppose C is a convex set and $f : C \to \mathbf{H}^n$. We say that f is $\mathbf{H}^n_+$-*convex* if the $\mathbf{H}^n_+$-epigraph

$$\operatorname{epi}_{\mathbf{H}^n_+}(f) := \{(X, T) \in C \times \mathbf{H}^n : f(X) \preceq T\}$$

is a convex set. Similarly f is $\mathbf{H}^n_+$-*concave* if the $\mathbf{H}^n_+$-hypograph

$$\operatorname{hyp}_{\mathbf{H}^n_+}(f) := \{(X, T) \in C \times \mathbf{H}^n : f(X) \succeq T\}$$

is a convex set.

Semidefinite representations A semidefinite program is an optimization problem that takes the form

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize} & \langle b, y \rangle \\ \text{subject to} & A_0 + y_1 A_1 + \cdots + y_n A_n \succeq 0 \end{array}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the optimization variable, b is a fixed vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathbf{H}^m$ are fixed $m \times m$ Hermitian matrices. The condition

$$A_0 + y_1 A_1 + \cdots + y_n A_n \succeq 0$$

is known as a *linear matrix inequality* (LMI) of size m. We will say that a convex set C has a *SDP representation* if it can be expressed using LMIs (we allow for lifting variables). To evaluate the size of a semidefinite representation we record the number of LMIs of each size. For example consider the following convex set H:

$$H = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \ : \ x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \text{ and } x_1 x_2 x_3 \geq 1\}.$$

One can show that H admits the following SDP representation:

$$H = \left\{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \ : \ \exists y, z \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & y \\ y & x_2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & z \\ z & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \begin{bmatrix} y & 1 \\ 1 & z \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}. \tag{5}$$

This SDP representation consists of 3 LMIs of size 2 each.

Kronecker products and their properties If $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m\times n}$ we denote by $A^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ the conjugate transpose of A. The *Kronecker product* of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m_1\times n_1}$ and $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m_2\times n_2}$ is the $\mathbb{C}^{n_1n_2\times m_1m_2}$ matrix $A \otimes B$ with

$$[A \otimes B]_{(i,k)(j,\ell)} = A_{ij}B_{k\ell} \qquad \text{for } 1 \le i \le n_1, 1 \le j \le n_2, 1 \le k \le m_1, 1 \le \ell \le m_2.$$

If A, B, C, D are matrices of compatible dimensions then $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC \otimes BD)$ and $(A \otimes B)^* = A^* \otimes B^*$. Suppose $A \in \mathbf{H}^n$ and $B \in \mathbf{H}^m$ are Hermitian matrices with eigenvalue decompositions $A = U\Lambda_A U^*$ and $B = V\Lambda_B V^*$ where U, V are unitary matrices and Λ_A and Λ_B are diagonal. Then $U \otimes V$ is unitary and $\Lambda_A \otimes \Lambda_B$ is diagonal and so

$$A \otimes B = (U \otimes V)(\Lambda_A \otimes \Lambda_B)(U \otimes V)^*$$

is an eigenvalue decomposition of $A \otimes B$.

3 SDP representations

This is the main section of the paper where we describe the SDP representations of the various functions in Table 1.

3.1 Matrix geometric mean

We first consider the SDP representation of the matrix geometric mean. Recall that the *t-weighted geometric mean* $G_t : \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \to \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ is defined by

$$G_t(A, B) = A\#_t B := A^{1/2}\left(A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}\right)^t A^{1/2}.$$

It is known [Bha09] that G_t is a matrix concave for $t \in [0, 1]$ and is matrix convex for $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$. We denote by hyp_t and epi_t the matrix hypograph and matrix epigraph of G_t respectively:

$$\text{hyp}_t = \left\{(A, B, T) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n : A\#_t B \succeq T\right\}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$, and

$$\text{epi}_t = \left\{(A, B, T) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n : A\#_t B \preceq T\right\}$$

for $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$. These notations do not keep track of the dimension n explicitly but this omission should not cause any confusion.

The next theorem shows that the matrix geometric mean G_t for rational $t = p/q$ admits an SDP formulation involving $O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size at most $2n \times 2n$. The case $t \in [0, 1]$ was already obtained by Sagnol [Sag13]. In Appendix A, we explicitly describe our construction (on which our CVX code is based) and establish its correctness.

Theorem 3. *Let p, q be relatively prime integers with $p/q \in [-1, 2]$.*

- *If $p/q \in [0, 1]$ then $\text{hyp}_{p/q}$ has a SDP description with at most $2\lfloor\log_2(q)\rfloor + 1$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$.*
- *If $p/q \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$ then $\text{epi}_{p/q}$ has a SDP description with at most $2\lfloor\log_2(q)\rfloor + 2$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$.*

Proof. The construction is detailed in Appendix A. □

3.2 SDP description for functions in Table 1

In this section we show how the SDP description of the matrix geometric mean can be used to obtain an SDP description of the functions given in Table 1.

3.2.1 Lieb's function

We first consider Lieb's function. The following is a restatement of Theorem 2 from the introduction with the additional case $t \in [-1,0] \cup [1,2]$.

Theorem 4. *Let K be a fixed matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{n\times m}$ and let $t = p/q$ be any rational number in $[-1,2]$. Let $F_t(A,B) = \operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right]$.*

- *If $t = p/q \in [0,1]$, then F_t is concave and its hypograph admits a semidefinite programming representation using at most $2\lfloor \log_2 q \rfloor + 1$ LMIs of size $2nm \times 2nm$, one LMI of size $nm \times nm$ and one scalar inequality.*
- *If $t = p/q \in [-1,0] \cup [1,2]$, then F_t is convex and its epigraph admits a semidefinite programming representation using at most $2\lfloor \log_2 q \rfloor + 2$ LMIs of size $2nm \times 2nm$, one LMI of size $nm \times nm$ and one scalar inequality.*

Proof. To prove this theorem we use the well-known relationship between F_t and the matrix-valued function $L_t(A,B) = A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t$ due to Ando. In fact it is not difficult to verify that we have the following identity:

$$\operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right] = \operatorname{vec}(K)^* (A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t) \operatorname{vec}(K) \tag{6}$$

where $\operatorname{vec}(K)$ is a column vector of size nm obtaining by concatenating the rows of K and $\bar{B}$ is the entrywise complex conjugate of B (see e.g., [Car10, Lemma 5.12]). Thus, if $t \in [0,1]$ we have for any real number τ

$$\operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^{1-t} K B^t\right] \geq \tau \iff \exists T \in \mathbf{H}^{nm}_{++} \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t \succeq T \\ \operatorname{vec}(K)^* T \operatorname{vec}(K) \geq \tau. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

We now show how to convert (7) into an SDP formulation. The key idea (see e.g., [NEG13]) is to note that

$$A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t = (A \otimes I) \#_t (I \otimes \bar{B}) \tag{8}$$

where I denotes the identity matrix of appropriate size. To see why (8) holds, note that $A \otimes I$ and $I \otimes \bar{B}$ commute and so

$$(A \otimes I) \#_t (I \otimes \bar{B}) = (A \otimes I)^{1-t} (I \otimes \bar{B})^t \overset{(a)}{=} (A^{1-t} \otimes I)(I \otimes \bar{B}^t) \overset{(b)}{=} A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t$$

where (a) can be shown using the eigenvalue decompositions of $A \otimes I$ and $I \otimes \bar{B}$, and (b) follows from the properties of the Kronecker product. Using the SDP formulation of the matrix geometric mean (Theorem 3) we can thus formulate the constraint $A^{1-t} \otimes \bar{B}^t \succeq T$ using $2\lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor + 1$ LMIs of size $2nm \times 2nm$ and one LMI of size $nm \times nm$ (where $t = p/q$). Plugging this in (7) gives us an SDP formulation of the hypograph of Lieb's function with the required size. The case $t \in [-1,0] \cup [1,2]$ is treated in the same way. ∎

Remark 1.

- *It is straightforward to extend Theorem 4 to get an SDP formulation of the functions $(A, B) \mapsto A^s \otimes B^t$ where s and t are nonnegative numbers such that $s + t \leq 1$. It suffices to observe that*

$$A^s \otimes B^t \succeq T \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \exists S \in \mathbf{H}^{nm}_+ \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} A^{\frac{s}{s+t}} \otimes B^{\frac{t}{s+t}} \succeq S \\ S^{s+t} \succeq T. \end{cases}$$

- *Similarly one can also extend Theorem 4 to obtain an SDP formulation of a k-variate generalization of the Lieb function, namely*

$$(A_1, \ldots, A_k) \mapsto A_1^{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_k^{t_k}$$

where $t_1, \ldots, t_k \geq 0$ are such that $t_1 + \cdots + t_k = 1$. To do so we simply eliminate one matrix at a time. For example in the case $k = 3$ we use:

$$A_1^{t_1} \otimes A_2^{t_2} \otimes A_3^{t_3} \succeq T \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \exists S \in \mathbf{H}^{n_1 n_2}_+ \text{ s.t. } \begin{cases} A_1^{\frac{t_1}{t_1+t_2}} \otimes A_2^{\frac{t_2}{t_1+t_2}} \succeq S \\ S^{t_1+t_2} \otimes A_3^{t_3} \succeq T. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2 (Tsallis entropies)**.**

- *For $t \in [0, 1]$ the* Tsallis entropy *[Tsa88] is defined as*

$$S_t(A) := \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{tr} \left[A^{1-t} - A \right].$$

It is easy to see that $S_t(A)$ converges to the von Neumann entropy $S(A) = -\mathrm{tr}[A \log A]$ when $t \to 0$. Also note that S_t is concave for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Using the SDP description of the matrix geometric mean (with $B = I$) we can get an SDP description of S_t (when $t = p/q$) with $O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size at most $2n$.

- *The Tsallis* relative entropy *is defined for $t \in [0, 1]$ as (see [Abe03] and also [FYK04])*

$$S_t(A \| B) := \frac{1}{t} \mathrm{tr} \left[A - A^{1-t} B^t \right].$$

As noted in (4) the Tsallis relative entropy $S_t(A\|B)$ converges to the quantum relative entropy $S(A\|B) = \mathrm{tr}\left[A(\log A - \log B)\right]$ when $t \to 0$. By choosing $K = I$ in Lieb's theorem we see that S_t is jointly convex in (A, B) and we easily get from Theorem 4 an SDP description of S_t with $O(\log_2 q)$ LMIs of size at most $2nm$ (where $t = p/q$).

3.2.2 The map $A \mapsto \mathbf{tr}\left[(K^* A^t K)^{1/t}\right]$

Let K be a fixed $n \times m$ matrix and consider the function $\Upsilon_t : \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Upsilon_t(A) = \mathrm{tr} \left[(K^* A^t K)^{1/t} \right].$$

The following result is due to Carlen and Lieb [CL08] where they established the case $t \in [0, 2]$ (the same arguments were used to prove the case $t \in [-1, 0)$ in [FL13]; the case $t \in (0, 1]$ was first established by Epstein [Eps73]).

Theorem 5. *If $t \in [1, 2]$ then Υ_t is convex on $\mathbf{H}^n_+$. If $t \in [-1, 1] \setminus \{0\}$ then Υ_t is concave on $\mathbf{H}^n_+$.*

In this section we show how to give SDP formulations of $\mathrm{hyp}(\Upsilon_t)$ for $t \in [-1,1]\setminus\{0\}$ and $\mathrm{epi}(\Upsilon_t)$ for $t \in [1,2]$ by using our SDP formulations of Lieb's function in different regimes of the parameters. Our SDP formulations rely on variational expressions for $t\Upsilon_t$ (equations (9) and (11) to follow) established in [CL08] (see also [Car10]). We include a proof of these variational descriptions, for completeness, en route to our expressions for the hypograph/epigraph of $t\Upsilon_t$ in terms of Lieb's function (equations (10) and (12) to follow).

Lemma 1. *Let $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and $t \in [-1,2]\setminus\{0\}$.*

- *If $t \in (0,1]$ then*

$$t\Upsilon_t(A) = \max_{X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}} \mathrm{tr}\left[K^* A^t K X^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\mathrm{tr}[X]. \tag{9}$$

  Hence

$$\mathrm{hyp}(t\Upsilon_t) = \left\{(A,\tau) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbb{R} : \exists X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++} \text{ s.t. } \mathrm{tr}\left[K^* A^t K X^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\mathrm{tr}[X] \geq \tau\right\}. \tag{10}$$

- *If $t \in [-1,0)\cup[1,2]$ then*

$$t\Upsilon_t(A) = \min_{X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}} \mathrm{tr}\left[K^* A^t K X^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\mathrm{tr}[X]. \tag{11}$$

  Hence

$$\mathrm{epi}(t\Upsilon_t) = \left\{(A,\tau) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbb{R} : \exists X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++} \text{ s.t. } \mathrm{tr}\left[K^* A^t K X^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\mathrm{tr}[X] \leq \tau\right\}. \tag{12}$$

Proof. First observe that if $t \in [0,1]$ and $y,z > 0$ then the arithmetic-mean geometric-mean inequality gives

$$ty \geq y^t z^{1-t} - (1-t)z \tag{13}$$

for all $y,z>0$. If $t \in [1,2]$ and $y,z>0$ then the arithmetic-mean geometric-mean inequality gives $\frac{1}{t}y^t + \frac{t-1}{t}z^t \geq yz^{t-1}$. Rearranging gives

$$ty \leq y^t z^{1-t} - (1-t)z \tag{14}$$

for all $y,z>0$. If $t \in [-1,0]$ and $a,b>0$ then $s = 1-t \in [1,2]$. Hence $sa + (1-s)b \leq a^t b^{1-s}$. Putting $y=b$ and $z=a$ we obtain that (14) also holds when $t \in [-1,0]$ for all $y,z>0$.

We can apply inequalities (13) and (14) to the eigenvalues of the positive definite commuting matrices $Y = (K^*A^tK)^{1/t} \otimes I$ and $Z = I \otimes \bar{X}$ (with $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and $X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}$). Doing so we see that if $t \in (0,1]$ then

$$t(K^*A^tK)^{1/t} \otimes I \succeq K^*A^tK \otimes \bar{X}^{1-t} - (1-t)(I \otimes \bar{X})$$

for all $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and all $X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}$. Similarly if $t \in [-1,0)\cup[1,2]$ then

$$t(K^*A^tK)^{1/t} \otimes I \preceq K^*A^tK \otimes \bar{X}^{1-t} - (1-t)(I \otimes \bar{X})$$

for all $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and all $X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}$. If we apply the map $\mathbf{H}^{m^2} \ni M \mapsto \mathrm{vec}(I)^* M \,\mathrm{vec}(I)$ to both sides of these matrix inequalities and use identity (6) we get that for $t \in [0,1)$

$$t\Upsilon_t(A) \geq \mathrm{tr}\left[K^*A^tKX^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\mathrm{tr}[X]$$

for all $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and all $X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}$, and for $t \in [-1,0) \cup [1,2]$

$$t\Upsilon_t(A) \leq \operatorname{tr}\left[K^* A^t K X^{1-t}\right] - (1-t)\operatorname{tr}[X]$$

for all $A \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ and all $X \in \mathbf{H}^m_{++}$. To ensure that the variational formulas (9) and (11) hold, one simply checks that putting $X = (K^*AK)^{1/t}$ gives equality in both cases. The descriptions of $\operatorname{hyp}(t\Upsilon_t)$ for $t \in (0,1]$ and $\operatorname{epi}(t\Upsilon_t)$ for $t \in [-1,0) \cup [1,2]$ are direct consequences of (9) and (11) respectively. □

When t is rational, each of the convex sets (10) and (12) can be expressed explicitly in terms of LMIs by using the SDP description of Lieb's function from Theorem 4. The following summarizes the size of these descriptions.

Theorem 6. *Let p, q be relatively prime integers such that $p/q \in [-1,2] \setminus \{0\}$.*

- *If $t = p/q \in (0,1]$ then $\operatorname{hyp}(t\Upsilon_t)$ has a SDP description with at most $2\lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor + 1$ LMIs of size $2mn \times 2mn$, one LMI of size $mn \times mn$, and one scalar inequality.*
- *If $t = p/q \in [-1,0) \cup [1,2]$ then $\operatorname{epi}(t\Upsilon_t)$ has a SDP description with at most $2\lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor + 2$ LMIs of size $2mn \times 2mn$, one LMI of size $mn \times mn$, and one scalar inequality.*

4 Conclusion

We conclude by discussing the possibility of a SDP representation for a related jointly convex/concave function.

Sandwiched Rényi divergence The *sandwiched Rényi divergence* introduced in [MLDS+13, WWY14] is defined as

$$(A,B) \mapsto \operatorname{tr}\left[\left(A^{\frac{1-t}{2t}} B A^{\frac{1-t}{2t}}\right)^t\right]. \tag{15}$$

In [FL13] Frank and Lieb proved that (15) is jointly concave for $t \in [1/2, 1]$ and jointly convex for $t \geq 1$. Note that if A and B commute then (15) reduces to $\operatorname{tr}\left[A^{1-t}B^t\right]$; however these two expressions are different for general noncommuting matrices A and B. The quantity (15) has found applications in quantum information theory, see e.g., [Tom15]. In the case $t = 1/2$, the expression (15) is called the *fidelity* of A and B and is known to have the following semidefinite programming formulation [Wat15, Section 3.2]:

$$\operatorname{tr}\left[\left(A^{1/2} B A^{1/2}\right)^{1/2}\right] = \max_{Z \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}} \frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{tr}[Z] + \operatorname{tr}[Z^*]\right) \ : \ \begin{bmatrix} A & Z \\ Z^* & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

A natural question is:

Problem 1. *Find a semidefinite programming formulation for (15) for any $t \geq 1/2$ rational.*

Acknowledgments

Hamza Fawzi was supported in part by AFOSR FA9550-11-1-0305. James Saunderson was supported by NSF grant CCF-1409836.

Hamza Fawzi would like to thank Omar Fawzi for fruiful discussions that provided the motivation for this paper, and for useful comments on a previous version of this manuscript that helped improve the presentation.

A Construction for the matrix geometric mean

In this section we give an SDP description of the matrix geometric mean. Our construction heavily relies on the properties of the geometric mean which we review below.

A.1 Properties of the matrix geometric mean

For convenience, we first recall the definition of the *t-weighted geometric mean* $G_t : \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \to \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$:

$$G_t(A, B) = A\#_t B := A^{1/2} \left(A^{-1/2} B A^{-1/2}\right)^t A^{1/2}.$$

The following lemma summarizes important and well-known properties of the weighted geometric mean used in our construction.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $A, B \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$.*

(i) If X is an $n \times n$ invertible matrix and $t \in [0, 1]$ then $X(A\#_t B)X^* = (XAX^*)\#_t(XBX^*)$.

(ii) (Monotonicity) If $A \succeq B \succeq 0$ and $C \succeq D \succeq 0$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ then $A\#_t C \succeq B\#_t D$.

(iii) For any $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$A\#_t B = B\#_{1-t} A \tag{16}$$
$$A\#_s(A\#_t B) = A\#_{st} B \quad \text{and} \tag{17}$$
$$(A\#_t B)\#_s B = A\#_{s+t-st} B. \tag{18}$$

(iv) For any $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, and any $X \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$,

$$X\#_s A \succeq X\#_t B \iff X\#_{-s} A \preceq X\#_{-t} B \iff A\#_{s+1} X \preceq B\#_{t+1} X. \tag{19}$$

Proof. Properties (i)-(iii) are well-known, see e.g., [LL13, Lemma 2.1]. We only include a proof of (iv). By first multiplying on the left and right by $X^{-1/2}$, then inverting both sides, then multiplying on the left and right by $X^{1/2}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} X\#_s A \succeq X\#_t B &\iff (X^{-1/2} A X^{-1/2})^s \succeq (X^{-1/2} B X^{-1/2})^t \\ &\iff (X^{-1/2} B X^{-1/2})^{-t} \succeq (X^{-1/2} A X^{-1/2})^{-s} \\ &\iff X\#_{-t} B \succeq X\#_{-s} A. \end{aligned}$$

Finally it follows from (16) that $X\#_{-t} B \succeq X\#_{-s} A$ is equivalent to $B\#_{t+1} X \succeq A\#_{s+1} X$. □

The properties given in Lemma 2 can be directly translated to relationships between the hypographs/epigraphs of the matrix geometric mean. Recall that hyp_t and epi_t are defined as:

$$\mathrm{hyp}_t := \left\{(A, B, T) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n : A\#_t B \succeq T\right\}$$

for $t \in [0, 1]$, and

$$\mathrm{epi}_t := \left\{(A, B, T) \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n : A\#_t B \preceq T\right\}$$

for $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$.

Lemma 3. *The following holds:*

(i) If $t \in [0,1]$ then

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{1-t} = \{(A,B,T) : (B,A,T) \in \mathrm{hyp}_t\}. \tag{20}$$

(ii) If $t \in [-1,0] \cup [1,2]$ then

$$\mathrm{epi}_{1-t} = \{(A,B,T) : (B,A,T) \in \mathrm{epi}_t\}. \tag{21}$$

(iii) For any $s,t \in [0,1]$ we have

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{st} = \{(A,B,T) : \exists Z \;\; s.t. \;\; (A,B,Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_t, \;\; (A,Z,T) \in \mathrm{hyp}_s\}. \tag{22}$$

(iv) For any $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\mathrm{epi}_{-t} = \left\{(A,B,T) : \exists S \;\; s.t. \;\; (A,B,S) \in \mathrm{hyp}_t, \;\; \begin{bmatrix} T & A \\ A & S \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is a direct consequence of the properties of the matrix geometric mean stated in Lemma 2. We include a proof of (iv), the other items can be proved in a similar way. First observe that for any A, S positive definite we have $A\#_{-1}S = AS^{-1}A$ thus by the Schur complement lemma we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} T & A \\ A & S \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad \iff \quad A\#_{-1}S \preceq T. \tag{24}$$

To prove (23), suppose $(A,B,T) \in \mathrm{epi}_{-t}$, i.e., $A\#_{-t}B \preceq T$. Let $S = A\#_t B$. Then $A\#_{-1}S = A\#_{-1}(A\#_t B) = A\#_{-t}B \preceq T$. So, by (24) we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} T & A \\ A & S \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$$

as desired. For the reverse inclusion, suppose there exists $S \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ such that $A\#_t B \succeq S$ and $S \succeq A\#_{-1}T$. Then by (19) of Lemma 2 we have that

$$A\#_t B \succeq A\#_{-1}T \quad \Longrightarrow \quad A\#_{-t}B \preceq A\#_1 T = T$$

Hence $(A,B,T) \in \mathrm{epi}_{-t}$ as required. □

A.2 Semidefinite representation of the matrix geometric mean

The remainder of this section is devoted to getting an SDP description of the matrix geometric mean (Theorem 3). Our construction is recursive in nature and heavily relies on the properties of the matrix geometric mean given above. Section A.2.1 treats the base case $t = 1/2$, Section A.2.2 treats the case where $t = p/q \in [0,1]$ and q is a power of two and Section A.2.3 treats the case where $t = p/q \in [1/2,1]$ and p is a power of two. In Section A.2.4 we combine these cases together and complete the proof of Theorem 3.

A.2.1 Base case $t = 1/2$

The following well-known lemma gives an SDP description of $\mathrm{hyp}_{1/2}$. It forms the base case of our construction and we thus include a proof for completeness.

Lemma 4. *We have*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{1/2} = \left\{(A, B, T) : \begin{bmatrix} A & T \\ T & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0\right\}. \tag{25}$$

Proof. Using the Schur complement lemma and monotonicity of the matrix square root we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} A & T \\ T & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \iff B \succeq TA^{-1}T &\iff A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2} \succeq (A^{-1/2}TA^{-1/2})^2 \\ &\iff (A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2})^{1/2} \succeq A^{-1/2}TA^{-1/2} \\ &\iff A\#_{1/2}B \succeq 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3. *In the description* (25) (A, B, T) *is understood to be restricted to* $\mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \times \mathbf{H}^n$. *This will be implicit in our subsequent SDP descriptions of* hyp_t *and* epi_t.

A.2.2 Denominator is a power of two

In this section we give an SDP description of $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ when p is odd and ℓ is a positive integer such that $p < 2^\ell$. Observe that $p/2^\ell$ has a binary expansion of length ℓ as $(0.m_1m_2\cdots m_\ell)_2$ where $m_\ell = 1$ (because p is odd) and $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell - 1$. The construction can be expressed explicitly in terms of this binary expansion (see Proposition 1 to follow) by repeatedly applying the following result.

Lemma 5. *If* $t \in [0, 1/2]$ *then*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_t = \left\{(A, B, T) : \exists Z \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } (A, B, Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{2t},\ \begin{bmatrix} A & T \\ T & Z \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0\right\}. \tag{26}$$

If $t \in [1/2, 1]$ *then*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_t = \left\{(A, B, T) : \exists Z \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } (A, B, Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{2t-1},\ \begin{bmatrix} B & T \\ T & Z \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0\right\}. \tag{27}$$

Proof. If $t \in [0, 1/2]$ then $2t \in [0, 1]$. Hence $\mathrm{hyp}_t = \mathrm{hyp}_{(2t)(1/2)}$ can be expressed in terms of hyp_{2t} and $\mathrm{hyp}_{1/2}$ using (22). The condition $(A, Z, T) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{1/2}$ can then be rewritten as an LMI using Lemma 4 and this yields (26).

If $t \in [1/2, 1]$ then $1 - t \in [0, 1/2]$, so we use (26) together with the relationship between hyp_t and hyp_{1-t}. Applying (20) we have $\mathrm{hyp}_t = \{(A, B, T) : (B, A, T) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{1-t}\}$. Then, because $1 - t \in [0, 1/2]$, we can apply (26) giving

$$\mathrm{hyp}_t = \left\{(A, B, T) : \exists Z \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } (B, A, Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{2(1-t)},\ \begin{bmatrix} B & T \\ T & Z \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0\right\}.$$

Finally using (20) again we see that $(B, A, Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{2(1-t)}$ if and only if $(A, B, Z) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{1-2(1-t)} = \mathrm{hyp}_{2t-1}$, completing the proof. □

Suppose p is odd and ℓ is a positive integer with $p < 2^\ell$. Then by repeatedly applying Lemma 5, and using the expression for $\mathrm{hyp}_{1/2}$ in Lemma 4 as a base case, we can describe $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ in terms of ℓ LMIs, each of size $2n \times 2n$. Proposition 1, to follow, explicitly gives this semidefinite formulation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$. It is most naturally expressed in terms of the binary expansion of $p/2^\ell$. Note that if $m = 0$ then $A \#_m B = A$ and if $m = 1$ then $A \#_m B = B$. In particular, in each case the expression is actually linear in A and B.

Proposition 1. *Suppose p is an odd positive integer and ℓ is a positive integer such that $p < 2^\ell$. Let $p/2^\ell = (0.m_\ell m_{\ell-1} \cdots m_1)_2$ be the binary expansion of $p/2^\ell$ where $m_1 = 1$ and $m_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 2, \ldots, \ell$. Then*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell} = \left\{ (A, B, Z_\ell) : \exists Z_1, \ldots, Z_{\ell-1} \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } \begin{bmatrix} A \#_{m_i} B & Z_i \\ Z_i & Z_{i-1} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \text{ for } i = 2, 3, \ldots, \ell, \begin{bmatrix} A & Z_1 \\ Z_1 & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}. \quad (28)$$

Hence $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ has an SDP description with ℓ LMIs, each of size $2n \times 2n$.

Proof. The proof of correctness is by induction on ℓ. If $\ell = 1$ then necessarily $p = 1$. In this case the description of $\mathrm{hyp}_{1/2}$ in (28) matches that from Lemma 4 and so is correct. Now suppose $\ell > 1$, and let $p/2^\ell = (0.m_\ell m_{\ell-1} \cdots m_1)_2$ be the binary expansion of $p/2^\ell$. Then $p/2^\ell > 1/2$ if and only if $m_\ell = 1$ and $p/2^\ell < 1/2$ if and only if $m_\ell = 0$.

Hence if $m_\ell = 0$ then we apply (26) to express $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ in terms of $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^{\ell-1}}$ as

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell} = \left\{ (A, B, Z_\ell) : \exists Z_{\ell-1} \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } (A, B, Z_{\ell-1}) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^{\ell-1}}, \begin{bmatrix} A \#_{m_\ell} B & Z_\ell \\ Z_\ell & Z_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}.$$

Note that in this case the binary expansion of $p/2^{\ell-1}$ is $(0.m_{\ell-1} \cdots m_1)_2$, so we can apply the induction hypothesis to see that (28) is correct.

Similarly if $m_\ell = 1$ then we apply (27) to express $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ in terms of $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^{\ell-1}-1}$ as

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell} = \left\{ (A, B, Z_\ell) : \exists Z_{\ell-1} \in \mathbf{H}^n \text{ s.t. } (A, B, Z_{\ell-1}) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^{\ell-1}-1}, \begin{bmatrix} A \#_{m_\ell} B & Z_\ell \\ Z_\ell & Z_{\ell-1} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}.$$

Note that in this case the binary expansion of $p/2^{\ell-1} - 1$ is $(0.m_{\ell-1} \cdots m_1)_2$, so we can apply the induction hypothesis to see that (28) is correct. □

We conclude with an example in which the denominator is a power of two.

Example 1 (SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{5/8}$)**.** *Let $p = 5$ and $\ell = 3$ so that $p/2^\ell = 5/8 = (0.101)_2$. Consider constructing a SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{5/8}$. We have that $m_1 = m_3 = 1$ and $m_2 = 0$ so that $A \#_{m_1} B = B$ and $A \#_{m_2} B = A$. Applying Proposition 1 gives*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{5/8} = \left\{ (A, B, Z_3) : \exists Z_1, Z_2 \text{ s.t. } \begin{bmatrix} B & Z_3 \\ Z_3 & Z_2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \begin{bmatrix} A & Z_2 \\ Z_2 & Z_1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \begin{bmatrix} A & Z_1 \\ Z_1 & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right\}$$

using $\ell = 3$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$.

A.2.3 Numerator is a power of two

In this section we show how to construct an SDP representation of hyp_t when t has a numerator that is a power of two and $t \in [1/2, 1]$. We do this by relating hyp_t and $\text{hyp}_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}$ (see Lemma 6 to follow). This is useful because if $t = 2^\ell/q$ with $t \in [1/2, 1]$, then $\frac{2t-1}{t} = \frac{2^{\ell+1}-q}{2^\ell}$ has a denominator that is a power of two. Hence we can relate $\text{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$ with $\text{hyp}_{\frac{2^{\ell+1}-q}{2^\ell}}$, an SDP description of which we can obtain from Proposition 1.

Lemma 6. *If $t \in [1/2, 1]$ then*

$$\text{hyp}_t = \left\{ (A, B, T) : \exists Z, W \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++} \;\; s.t. \;\; (A, W, Z) \in \text{hyp}_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}, \;\; \begin{bmatrix} Z & W \\ W & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \;\; W \succeq T \right\}. \tag{29}$$

Proof. We first prove $\subseteq$. Suppose $A\#_t B \succeq T$. Then let $Z = A\#_{2t-1}B$ and $W = A\#_t B$. It is easy to see that the conditions on the right-hand side of (29) are satisfied. Indeed first we have

$$A\#_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}W = A\#_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}(A\#_t B) = A\#_{2t-1}B = Z$$

and this shows that $(A, W, Z) \in \text{hyp}_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}$. Second, using Property (18) and Lemma 4 we have,

$$Z\#_{1/2}B = (A\#_{2t-1}B)\#_{1/2}B = A\#_t B = W \quad \text{which implies that} \quad \begin{bmatrix} Z & W \\ W & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

Finally we have that $W = A\#_t B \succeq T$ by assumption.

We now prove $\supseteq$. Suppose there exist $Z, W \in \mathbf{H}^n_{++}$ such that $A\#_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}W \succeq Z$ and $W\#_{-1}B \preceq Z$ and $W \succeq T$. Then since $1 - \frac{2t-1}{t} = \frac{1}{t} - 1$ we have that $W\#_{1/t-1}A \succeq Z$. Then

$$W\#_{1/t-1}A \succeq Z \succeq W\#_{-1}B.$$

Applying (19) from Lemma 2 it follows that

$$B = B\#_{-1+1}W \succeq A\#_{1/t-1+1}W = A\#_{1/t}W.$$

Then since $t \in [1/2, 1]$ and G_t is monotone for $t \in [0, 1]$, applying $G_t(A, \cdot)$ to both sides gives

$$A\#_t B \succeq A\#_t(A\#_{1/t}W) = A\#_1 W = W \succeq T$$

as required. □

Note that if $t = 2^\ell/q$ then $\frac{2t-1}{t} = \frac{2^{\ell+1}-q}{2^\ell}$ is a dyadic number and so $\text{hyp}_{\frac{2t-1}{t}}$ has a SDP description from the previous section (Proposition 1).

Proposition 2. *Assume ℓ, q are integers such $\frac{2^\ell}{q} \in [1/2, 1]$. Then*

$$\text{hyp}_{2^\ell/q} = \left\{ (A, B, T) : \exists Z, W \;\; s.t. \;\; (A, W, Z) \in \text{hyp}_{\frac{2^{\ell+1}-q}{2^\ell}}, \;\; \begin{bmatrix} Z & W \\ W & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \;\; W \succeq T \right\}. \tag{30}$$

Hence $\text{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$ has a SDP representation using $\ell + 1$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$.

Proof. The SDP description follows directly from Lemma 6 with $t = \frac{2^\ell}{q}$. Since $\mathrm{hyp}_{\frac{2^{\ell+1}-q}{2^\ell}}$ has a SDP description with ℓ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ (cf. Proposition 1) the conclusion about the size of the description (30) holds. □

We conclude with an example in which the numerator is a power of two.

Example 2 (SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{8/13}$)**.** *Let $q = 13$ and $\ell = 3$ so that $2^\ell/q = 8/13$. Note that $8/13 \in [1/2, 1]$. Consider constructing an SDP description of $\mathrm{hyp}_{8/13}$. We have that $(2^{\ell+1} - q)/2^\ell = 3/8 = (0.011)_2$. Hence, by Proposition 2,*

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{8/13} = \left\{ (A, B, T) : \exists Z_3, W \;\; s.t. \;\; (A, W, Z_3) \in \mathrm{hyp}_{3/8}, \;\; \begin{bmatrix} Z_3 & W \\ W & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \;\; W \succeq T \right\}.$$

Using Proposition 1 to obtain a semidefinite descrption of $\mathrm{hyp}_{3/8}$ gives

$$\mathrm{hyp}_{8/13} = \left\{ (A, B, T) : \exists Z_3, W, Z_1, Z_2 \; s.t. \; \begin{bmatrix} A & Z_3 \\ Z_3 & Z_2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \; \begin{bmatrix} W & Z_2 \\ Z_2 & Z_1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \, , \begin{bmatrix} W & Z_1 \\ Z_1 & A \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \right.$$
$$\left. \begin{bmatrix} Z_3 & W \\ W & B \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \;\; W \succeq T \right\},$$

a SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{8/13}$ using $\ell + 1 = 4$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$.

A.2.4 Putting everything together and summary of construction

We now complete the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. First observe that, using relations established in Lemma 3, we only need to consider the case $p/q \in [0, 1/2]$: indeed if we have an SDP representation of hyp_t for $t \in [0, 1/2]$ then we can use the relationship between hyp_{1-t} and hyp_t in (20) to get an SDP representation for hyp_t in the range $t \in [1/2, 1]$ with no additional LMIs. Then using the relationship (23) between epi_{-t} and hyp_t we can get an SDP representation of epi_t for $t \in [-1, 0]$ with the addition of a single $2n \times 2n$ LMI. Finally using again the relationship (21) between epi_{1-t} and epi_t we get an SDP representation for epi_t where $t \in [1, 2]$.

It thus remains to prove the case where t is an arbitrary rational in $[0, 1/2]$. We show how to do this using the results from the two previous sections. If $t = p/q \in [0, 1/2]$ we decompose t as $t = (p/2^\ell) \cdot (2^\ell/q)$ where $\ell = \lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor$. By applying Propositions 1 and 2 to construct respectively $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ and $\mathrm{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$ and appealing to (22) we get an SDP description of hyp_t (note that $2^\ell/q \in [1/2, 1]$ since $\ell = \lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor$ and so Proposition 2 applies to get an SDP description of $\mathrm{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$).

To see that our SDP representation has the right size, the SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ uses at most ℓ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and the SDP representation of $\mathrm{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$ uses at most $\ell + 1$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$. Hence our description has at most $2\ell + 1 = 2\lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor + 1$ LMIs of size $2n \times 2n$ and one LMI of size $n \times n$. The size of the SDP representation for the epigraph case $t \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$ requires an additional $2n \times 2n$ LMI which comes from identity (23). □

Table 2 summarizes our SDP construction of the hypograph/epigraph of the matrix geometric mean for arbitrary rationals $t = p/q \in [-1, 2]$.

Semidefinite representation of $\mathbf{hyp}_t$ for $t = p/q \in [0, 1]$

(i) If q is a power of two
Use construction in Proposition 1.

(ii) If $t \in [1/2, 1]$ and p is a power of two
Use Proposition 2 which expresses hyp_t in terms of the hypograph of a dyadic number, then use (i).

(iii) If t is any rational in $[0, 1/2]$
Express t as $t = (p/2^\ell) \cdot (2^\ell/q)$ where $q = \lfloor \log_2(q) \rfloor$. Use (i) and (ii) to construct $\mathrm{hyp}_{p/2^\ell}$ and $\mathrm{hyp}_{2^\ell/q}$ and combine them using (22) to get hyp_t.

(iv) If t is any rational in $[1/2, 1]$
Use relationship (20) between hyp_t and hyp_{1-t} then apply (iii).

Semidefinite representation of $\mathbf{epi}_t$ for $t = p/q \in [-1, 0] \cup [1, 2]$

(i) If $t \in [-1, 0]$
Use (23) to express epi_t in terms of hyp_{-t} and apply box above.

(ii) If $t \in [1, 2]$
Use relationship (21) between epi_t and epi_{1-t} then apply (i).

Table 2: Semidefinite representation of the matrix geometric mean (Theorem 3).

References

[Abe03] Sumiyoshi Abe. Nonadditive generalization of the quantum Kullback-Leibler divergence for measuring the degree of purification. *Physical Review A*, 68(3):032302, 2003.

[Bha09] Rajendra Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2009.

[BTN01] Aharon Ben-Tal and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Lectures on modern convex optimization: analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications*. SIAM, 2001.

[Car10] Eric A. Carlen. Trace inequalities and quantum entropy. An introductory course. In *Entropy and the quantum*, volume 529, pages 73–140. AMS, 2010.

[CL08] Eric A. Carlen and Elliott H. Lieb. A Minkowski type trace inequality and strong subadditivity of quantum entropy II: convexity and concavity. *Letters in Mathematical Physics*, 83(2):107–126, 2008.

[CS15] Venkat Chandrasekaran and Parikshit Shah. Relative entropy optimization and its applications, 2015. To appear in *Mathematical Programming*. Available online at http://users.cms.caltech.edu/~venkatc/cs_rep_preprint.pdf.

[Eps73] H. Epstein. Remarks on two theorems of E. Lieb. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 31(4):317–325, 1973.

[FL13] Rupert L. Frank and Elliott H. Lieb. Monotonicity of a relative Rényi entropy. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12):122201, 2013.

[FSP15] Hamza Fawzi, James Saunderson, and Pablo A. Parrilo. Semidefinite approximations of the matrix logarithm. *In preparation*, 2015.

[FYK04] Shigeru Furuichi, Kenjiro Yanagi, and Ken Kuriyama. Fundamental properties of Tsallis relative entropy. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 45(12):4868–4877, 2004.

[GB14] Michael Grant and Stephen Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. http://cvxr.com/cvx, March 2014.

[HNS15] J. William Helton, Jiawang Nie, and Jeremy S. Semko. Free semidefinite representation of matrix power functions. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 465:347–362, 2015.

[KA80] Fumio Kubo and Tsuyoshi Ando. Means of positive linear operators. *Mathematische Annalen*, 246(3):205–224, 1980.

[Lie73] Elliott H. Lieb. Convex trace functions and the Wigner-Yanase-Dyson conjecture. *Advances in Mathematics*, 11(3):267–288, 1973.

[LL13] Jimmie Lawson and Yongdo Lim. Weighted means and Karcher equations of positive operators. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(39):15626–15632, 2013.

[LR73] Elliott H. Lieb and Mary Beth Ruskai. Proof of the strong subadditivity of quantum mechanical entropy. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 14(12):1938–1941, 1973.

[MLDS+13] Martin Müller-Lennert, Frédéric Dupuis, Oleg Szehr, Serge Fehr, and Marco Tomamichel. On quantum Rényi entropies: A new generalization and some properties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 54(12), 2013.

[NEG13] Ismail Nikoufar, Ali Ebadian, and Madjid Eshaghi Gordji. The simplest proof of Lieb concavity theorem. *Advances in Mathematics*, 248:531–533, 2013.

[Sag13] Guillaume Sagnol. On the semidefinite representation of real functions applied to symmetric matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 439(10):2829–2843, 2013.

[Tom15] Marco Tomamichel. *Quantum Information Processing with Finite Resources—Mathematical Foundations*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.

[Tsa88] Constantino Tsallis. Possible generalization of Boltzmann-Gibbs statistics. *Journal of statistical physics*, 52(1-2):479–487, 1988.

[Wat15] John Watrous. *Theory of Quantum Information*. 2015. Draft available at https://cs.uwaterloo.ca/~watrous/TQI/.

[WWY14] Mark M. Wilde, Andreas Winter, and Dong Yang. Strong converse for the classical capacity of entanglement-breaking and Hadamard channels via a sandwiched Rényi relative entropy. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 331(2):593–622, 2014.